

REGISTERED

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH

Commercial Complex(BDA),
Indiranagar,
Bangalore- 560 038.

Dated: 17 FEB 1988

APPLICATION NO.

985 /87 (F)

W.P. No.

APPLICANT

Shri V. Ilangovan

Vs

RESPONDENTS

The GM, Telecom, Bangalore & 3 Ors

To

1. Shri V. Ilangovan
No. 25, Vedanis
Hassan Road
Arasikere
Hassan District

2. Shri M. Raghavendra Achar
Advocate
1074-1075, Banashankari I Stage
Bangalore - 560 050

3. The General Manager
Telecom
Karnataka Circle
Bangalore - 560 009

4. The Divisional Engineer
Telegraphs
Davanagere Division
Davanagere

5. The Divisional Engineer
Telegraphs
Hassan Division
Hassan

6. The Sub-Divisional Engineer
Telegraphs
Arasikere
Hassan District

7. Shri M. Vasudeva Rao
Central Govt. Stng Counsel
High Court Building
Bangalore - 560 001

Subject: SENDING COPIES OF ORDER PASSED BY THE BENCH

Please find enclosed herewith the copy of ORDER/

~~ORDER~~ passed by this Tribunal in the above said application

on 11-2-88.

Received Copy
S. N. Alivann

S. V. E. DIYAN
17/2/88 (Father of the Applicant)

O/C

DEPUTY REGISTRAR
(JUDICIAL)

17-2-88

Encl: as above.

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE**

DATED THIS THE 11TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 1988

Present : Hon'ble Shri Justice K.S. Puttaswamy, Vice-Chairman
and
Hon'ble Shri P. Srinivasan, Member (A)

APPLICATION NO. 985/1987

Sri V. Ilangovan,
S/o. Vadial,
No.25, Vedanis,
Hassan Road,
Arsikere. **Applicant.**

(Shri M. Raghavendrachar, Advocate)

1

1. The General Manager,
Telecom, Bangalore.
2. Divisional Engineer,
Davanagere Division,
Davanagere.
3. Divisional Engineer,
Telegraphs,
Hassan Division,
Hassan.
4. Sub-Divisional Engineer,
Telegraphs,
Arasikere.

(Shri M. Vasudeva Rao, C.G.A.S.C.)

This application having come up for hearing to-day,
Vice-Chairman made the following:

ORDER

Heard Shri M. Raghavendrachar, learned Advocate for the applicant and Shri M. Vasudeva Rao, learned Additional Central Government Standing Counsel for the respondents.

2. This is an application filed under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 ('Act').

3. The applicant who has been working as a casual labourer of and on under the control of the Sub-Divisional Officer (Telegraphs) Arsikere, has sought for a direction to the respondents to regularise his services and for other incidental reliefs. In their reply, the respondents have resisted this application on diverse grounds.

4. On the very questions that arise before us, the Supreme Court in its order made on 27.10.1987 in Writ Petition No. 373 of 1986 and connected cases (DAILY RATED CASUAL LABOUR EMPLOYED UNDER P&T DEPARTMENT, THROUGH BHARATIYA DAK TAR MAZDOOR MANCH v. UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS) had issued various directions to the Union of India and its various subordinate authorities impleaded in those cases. We need hardly say that the directions issued by the Supreme Court in these cases are bound to be taken note of by the respondents in this application also and the case of the applicant also for regularisation and other claims regulated in terms of the order of the Supreme Court. We have no doubt that the respondents will do so. Even on the allotment of work and wages also, we have no doubt that respondents will do so on the length of service of the applicant and accommodate him wherever it is possible and only to the extent that is possible to do so. With these observations only we dispose of this application. But in the circumstances of the case we direct the parties to bear their own costs.

TRUE COPY

B.V. Venkatesh
DEPUTY REGISTRAR (JULY 1987)
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE

Sd/-

Vice-Chairman

1987
22-2-1987

Sd/-
Member (A)